



Signed and Filed: October 22, 2009

**THOMAS E. CARLSON
U.S. Bankruptcy Judge**

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

11 In re) Case No. 09-32268 TEC
12 FELY LAZARO SMIRNOFF,) Chapter 11
13 aka FELY SANTIAGO,)
14)
15 Debtor.)

)

MEMORANDUM RE RELIEF FROM STAY

18 On October 5, 2009, the court held a preliminary hearing
19 regarding the motion for relief from stay brought by secured
20 creditor First Federal Bank of California (Creditor) regarding the
21 real property known as 455-457 Potrero Avenue, San Francisco,
22 California (the Property). Marc Voisenat appeared for Debtor.
23 Edward S. Kim appeared for Creditor. The court announced at the
24 hearing that it would require Debtor to file a written response to
25 the motion, and it would hold a continued hearing. Upon further
26 consideration, the court determines that relief from stay should be
27 granted immediately.

28 The Property is a three-unit residential building that is used

MEMORANDUM RE RELIEF FROM STAY

1 by Debtor solely for the generation of income. Debtor's counsel
2 acknowledged at the hearing that Debtor has no equity in the
3 Property, as the amount due Creditor greatly exceeds the value of
4 the Property. That being the case, relief from stay must be
5 granted unless the Property is necessary to an effective
6 reorganization. 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(2). Debtor's counsel stated
7 that the Property was essential to an effective reorganization for
8 the following reasons: (1) Creditor's lien can be reduced to the
9 value of the property under section 506, because the Property is
10 not Debtor's residence; and (2) Debtor can propose a plan that will
11 pay Creditor's allowed secured claim in full with interest over
12 time from expected rental income, and still leave Debtor with a
13 positive cash flow to use to pay other creditors.

14 I determine that the Property is not necessary to an effective
15 reorganization, and that relief from stay should therefore be
16 granted, for the following reasons.

17 First, Debtor does not use the Property in the operation of a
18 business. The Property is not a plant, store, office, or warehouse
19 essential to the operation of a larger enterprise. It is simply
20 residential real property from which Debtor hopes to earn net
21 rental income.

22 Second, the court has serious questions as to whether Debtor
23 could ever have any significant positive cash flow, if the Property
24 is valued correctly accurately, and if the interest rate on the
25 secured claim is determined correctly. The Property is income-
26 producing property and will be valued primarily on the basis of its
27 expected net operating income. The higher the income, the higher
28 the value of the Property. The debt service that Debtor must pay

MEMORANDUM RE RELIEF FROM STAY

-2-

1 from the net operating income is a function of the amount of the
2 debt, the length of the amortization, and the interest rate. The
3 debt service Debtor will have to pay will be very high relative to
4 the net operating income for two reasons: (1) Debtor's scenario
5 necessarily contemplates a loan-to-value ratio of 100 percent; and
6 (2) the court would have to require Debtor to pay a relatively high
7 rate of interest, and could not permit Debtor to fix an unusually
8 long amortization period, because of the high loan-to-value ratio
9 and Debtor's poor history of payment. Thus, it appears unlikely
10 that the net operating income is likely to be substantially in
11 excess of what this Debtor would have to pay to service a loan
12 equal to 100 percent of the current fair market value of the
13 Property.

14 Third, it is extremely unlikely that Debtor could confirm a
15 plan under which he retained the Property. Debtor states that the
16 fair market value of the property is \$450,000 and that the amount
17 due under the deed of trust held by Creditor is \$770,000. If
18 Debtor did succeed in reducing Creditor's secured claim to
19 \$450,000, Creditor would have an unsecured deficiency claim of
20 \$320,000. Section 1111(b). Debtor can confirm a plan under which
21 he retains the Property, only if each class of unsecured creditors
22 is paid in full (impossible here) or votes to accept the plan.
23 Section 1129(b)(2)(B). Any unsecured creditor holding one-third of
24 the allowed unsecured claims within a given class can block
25 acceptance of the plan by that class. Section 1126(c). Debtor's
26 scheduled unsecured claims total \$92,500. Creditor could use its
27 unsecured deficiency claim to block acceptance of any plan under
28 which Debtor retained the Property.

MEMORANDUM RE RELIEF FROM STAY

-3-

1 The only way in which denial of relief from stay could
2 legitimately further reorganization is to prevent the Creditor's
3 deficiency claim from being asserted against other assets of the
4 estate. The court has prevented that by granting relief from stay
5 to permit non-judicial foreclosure, under which there will be no
6 deficiency claim.

7 Cause exists to grant relief from stay.

8 ****END OF MEMORANDUM****

9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

MEMORANDUM RE RELIEF FROM STAY

-4-

Court Service List

Marc Voisenat, Esq.
Law Offices of Marc Voisenat
1330 Broadway, Suite 1035
Oakland, CA 94612

Edward S. Kim, Esq.
Hemar, Rousso and Heald
15910 Ventura Blvd. 12th Floor
Encino, CA 91436